6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

to add that, from the last quarter of the nineteenth century up to the Sarajevo outrage, Slavonic problems were localised in the Balkans, and that this did not help to facilitate their understanding, nor to procure for them an impartial judgement?

European 'volcano,' or 'rheumatism,' 'nest of vipers'—day in, day out, metaphors such as these flowed from the pens of our propagandists and diplomats when they were reviewing Balkan politics, because they were not prepared to admit that the crises in which these politics involved Europe were simply the repercussions of rivalry and scheming among the Great Powers.

If we leave diplomatic and political circles and pass to the public at large, we find that the word 'Slav' aroused more distrust than curiosity. For some people, it smacked of Nihilism or of Revolution; for others (forgetting that more than a quarter of the Slavonic world is Catholic) it held a menace to the unity of the Church. Slav refugees had fought on all the barricades during the nineteenth century; their names figured largely in the police alien records. In short, this word 'Slavism' suggested a set of psychological characteristics, rather than a geographical or national reality, and these characteristics—or their interpretation—made up a picture which the average Frenchman did not find very reassuring for Latin civilisation.

Whereas the political world adopted the caricature of Slavism outlined by the diplomats of the Ballplatz, the intellectual world, in its turn, often fell under German influence when dealing with the problems of Slavonic life. There was, in France, especially after 1870, a brilliant school of Slavicisers, who had studied the question on the spot. But for a long time it was restricted to a small number of enthusiasts, who lacked a sufficiently numerous audience to popularise their teaching.

Moreover, the early history of this teaching was unfortunate. The first holder of the Chair 'of Slavonic Language and Literature' at the *Collège de France* was Poland's most celebrated poet, Adam Mickiewicz. He was denounced to the Senate as a 'Panslavist'—a vague, but serious offence. For the time being, a well-chosen plural was sufficient to remove this offence: the chair changed its title and became the 'Chair of Languages and Literatures of Slavonic Origin'. Later on, however, Mickiewicz, accused of exaggerated mysticism and eccentricity, was obliged to give up lecturing altogether. The fate

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

of his successor, Cyprien Robert, from Anjou, was scarcely less romantic. After the 1848 rising he was suspected of having left for America, with the followers of Cabet, in search of Icaria. This sufficed to give credence to the idea that Slavology tends to unbalance those who profess it.

With Louis Léger, it is true, this science found its equilibrium and its discipline. But under Léger's guidance, Slavonic research tended to centre around Philology, and this orientation seems to have been permanent. The instruction gained in solidity what it lost in breadth; its beneficiaries, necessarily restricted in number, have never succeeded in forming a political team of Slavicisers such as would have given our diplomacy the orientation it lacked at the time of the two great crises of the present century.

Apart from what we may call Germanic interference, the Slavs have done a great deal towards helping to obscure or to emphasise their own characteristic features. What chance was there, in the past, of forming impartial ideas about the Russians from Polish testimony, or vice versa? About the Czechs, from Russian testimony? Or about the Catholic Slavs, from the testimony of the Orthodox? Outside an *élite* of thinkers, poets, scholars, who were the promoters and leading spirits of Slavonic Congresses, there was, between these nations, presumed to be of the same stock, nothing but rivalry, quarrels, and mistrust—piously encouraged, moreover, by their powerful neighbours. Denominational differences were stronger than race-solidarity; the Moujik felt that a Rumanian who made his sign of the cross with three fingers was nearer to him than the Slovak or the Croat who made his with his whole hand, or than the Czech philosopher, persecuted by the Austrian authorities as a 'dangerous Panslavist'.

The inter-penetration of the different sections of Slavonic culture was so little developed that the great Russian poet, Pushkin, was deceived by Mérimée's literary hoax, when the latter published, under the title of *Guzla,* a so-called translation of Dalmatian songs.

When Russian literature was revealed to the West, the latter greeted it with a defiant, or perverse, curiosity. *Monstrum invenimus.* French scholars saw in it less a new philosophy of life than an intellectual or sentimental pathology. De Vogüé, who introduced the Russian novel into France, warned his readers

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

no oppressor of the Slavonic race other than the Turk, Krijanich added the German. He was the ancestor of the Russian Slavophiles of the nineteenth century. He was completely out of harmony with his age, which could not understand an argument combining the Slavonic idea with Roman Uniatism. He met the usual fate of a precursor. Having offered his services as Librarian to the Czar Alexis Mikailovitch, he obtained from Moscow a mission to reform Russian spelling; the manuscript of this work was recovered at Tver in 1888. But it was not long before he was suspected of being a Papist agent, and was deported to Siberia, in circumstances which have never been cleared up. At Tobolsk he drew up a treatise on 'Politics' which, on the lines of Machiavelli's work, was intended to deduce, from the principles of good and evil, the laws of the art of government. Was Peter the Great acquainted with this treatise, and was he influenced by it? Unfortunately, that is a matter which scholarship has not yet been able to decide. After that we lose trace of Krijanich. A Dutch traveller relates that a monk of that name died under the walls of Vienna, in the ranks of Sobieski's army; such would seem to be the crowning adventure of that strange visionary, promoter of a doctrine which was to be revived two hundred years later by a pleiad of thinkers and scholars and which, freed of its denominational utopianism, will remain the 'credo' of the apostles of Slav solidarity.

After the capture of Azov from the Turks by Peter the Great in 1696, the centre of gravity of Slavonic hopes was fixed in Russia. If we exclude the Polish point of view, it remained there for more than two centuries. The three reigns of Peter the Great, Catherine II, and Alexander I, helped to awaken the Russian national conscience by contact with the Slavs of the Balkans, Austria, and Hungary. This contact set up currents of mutual influence between sister-nations, discovering each other after long centuries of isolation and mutual ignorance. A Serbian Academician, M. Stoyanovich, published a series of testimonies from Serbs who were contemporaries of Peter the Great, from which it appears that, from this time onwards, the Southern Slavs considered Russian successes as their own.

Readers will not be surprised at the omission here of any reference to the 'Will of Peter the Great', which the Chevalier d'Eon, of dubious reputation, was said to have brought from